



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

that she would soon appear on the operatic stage. The harmful nature of such notoriety is too obvious to require much comment. Its tendency to lower the standard of morality can hardly be questioned; but it is surely illogical to claim that a similar result is effected by the rescue work which seeks to raise the sinner. The compassion for a fallen woman is born of reverence for pure womanhood, and does not mitigate the loathing of the sin.

The pity of it is that the sin is irrevocable; that no repentance, no forgiveness, no later uprightness, can make it possible for the woman to live the life that has no darkness to hide, or to forget that she has fallen. Yet she may deserve our affection, our sincere respect; by her victory over sin she may pass on the upward way those who once held out to her their sustaining hands.

Any one who contrasts the repulsive, almost brutalized, countenances of those who have grown old in vice with the comparatively innocent face of the girl who has but lately set her feet in evil ways, must shudder at the thought of the terrible retribution.

A report pleading for the rescue of girls just entering a career of crime says: "This is a need that affects the future of our city; for those whom we would save are soon to take their places among the mothers; and not to meet the need is to pursue a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy, which puts to shame the business foresight of a modern American city."

And further: "Every life rescued from vice, vagabondage, and despair, and established in the ways of upright living, is so much gain to our civilization. But only when to this is added the higher Christian motive of the infinite value and far-reaching possibilities of each human soul can the full significance and importance of this rescue work be realized."

M. BOURCHIER SANFORD.

THE SOLDIER AND THE CITIZEN.

WHEN the soldier's malevolent critics shall have ceased their unjust and ungrateful aspersions in magazine, journal, and stump speech, the trite subject of his heroism and sacrifices may be dropped for a while at least, but not, in justice, until then.

While the surviving "bummers and mendicants," the "skulkers and hospitalers," of the war are held up to public reprobation, the saving clause is sometimes condescendingly appended, that so large a body as the veterans form must necessarily represent all classes and conditions of men. But we refuse to admit the truth of this saving clause. There were several classes who were not represented, and never could be represented, in any army like that which conquered the rebellion. The blind, deaf, and halt, dwarfs, lunatics, and idiots (save those whom faithful service and terrible suffering made such), were not represented. There were men whom no inducement could persuade, no force could compel, to face the fearful hazards of war; men who, if their own firesides were attacked by an armed foe, would flee without striking a blow; who, if their own wives and children were in danger, would first seek a place of safety for themselves. No sudden fever of patriotism, no noble love of adventure, no thirst for martial glory, not even a princely bounty, could tempt these men where bullets were hissing and shells were shrieking. Were they drafted? There were substitutes to be bought, or, if this were too expensive a means of escape, there was a sure refuge beyond the St. Lawrence—at least there was the *dernier*

ressort of self-inflicted disability. Were they tricked into enlisting while in their cups, or did they go through the form of enlistment to escape other penalties for their misdeeds? The first roll-call showed them among the "missing."

There were other men who were not represented in the army, men to whom the war, with all its horrors to others, was but one tremendous flood-tide bearing on to fortune. What business had they at the front, when each day of those four years was literally one long chain of "golden" moments? And there were still others, men who, though they were not brave or self-sacrificing enough to leave their own States and enter the ranks of their country's would-be destroyers, yet hated with all their souls her friends and saviours, who did all in their power—consistently with their personal safety—to give aid and comfort to her enemies. Some of these very men are prominent enough *now* in their relations with the army. Of all the malcontents at the nation's liberality to her defenders, they are the most active and bitter.

With these modifications, the "saving clause" quoted at the beginning of this paper may be accepted as true. It goes without saying that the bravest, noblest, and manliest, the most unselfish and patriotic,—in short, the flower of the virtue and strength of the land,—were represented in the army; quite as fully, it may be safely added, as they were represented at home. There were men of brilliant genius, of ripe scholarship, men of the highest standing in social, religious, political, and business circles. There were also, as a matter of course, men of the lower orders of intelligence and morality; loafers, shirks, drunkards, wife-beaters, blacklegs, and jail-birds. Cowards and "skulkers" are usually included in the black-list, but there were bad enough men and enough bad men in the army without special mention of these—by the stay-at-home critics, at all events. The cruel and bitterly unjust mistake, either intended or made unthinkingly, is to place the worst representatives of the veterans in the foreground. If his censors are to be believed, the typical veteran is a shirk, a "beat," a pension-beggar. The truth probably is that the rank and file of the army were not much better, and certainly no worse, than the average body of citizens, and that its survivors are no more greedy or grasping now than men in general would be in their place.

How does the average citizen look upon the soldiers? We all know how he regarded them during the war; we all know, too, with what generous enthusiasm he welcomed them home to the security and prosperity they had won for both themselves and him, how he threw up his hat, shouted himself hoarse, and freely contributed his dollars for bunting and hot coffee.

But generous enthusiasm is like rich perfume—volatile. Little by little, the "brave defenders" have come down from their pedestals in the citizen's estimation. Not all of them, of course. The strong of body and mind, the wealthy, the cultured—in short, the self-supporting in general—still retain his respect and a more or less latent residuum of grateful recognition for their old-time heroism. But the disabled, the poor, those whom advancing years render incapable of supporting themselves and their families, are fast becoming a burden and a bore.

It is true that the burden and the bore are still borne with little effective opposition; that, though there is much ill-natured grumbling from many sources, the enormous and increasing drafts which the soldiers make on the national treasury are still honored,

But cannot this strong, free, prosperous nation, made so by these men who now in their turn look to it for succor, continue for a few years longer *uncomplainingly* a recognition which, despite its falling-off in fervor of sentiment, has thus far surpassed that of any other nation in history? What if the tax is great? It is utterly insignificant in comparison with the deserts of those for whom it is levied; for, be it remembered, while it can last but a few years longer at most, the rich fruits of all that suffering and sacrifice will last to the end of time.

A SOLDIER.

NEEDS OF THE NAVAL RESERVE.

It is no news to any well-informed person that the United States has not at present enough seamen to man its war vessels. That is a condition which will at some time disappear, for it is not conceivable that Congress will permit an aged law to cramp the vigorous youth of our new defensive policy. But it is equally inconceivable that we shall ever maintain the navy in time of peace on a war basis. That being the case, it is obvious that we must rely on the possession of a thoroughly drilled and experienced reserve force to call upon in the case of any sudden outbreak of hostilities. The nucleus of that reserve force has been formed, and it is composed of good material. It is true that the First Battalion, Naval Reserve Artillery, is not prepared to man a harbor-defence vessel to-morrow, but it is beyond dispute that it can be made ready in thirty days.

The preparation of the battalion for active service is in the hands of the people. The State of New York has given the organization a legal name. What it needs now is a local habitation. There is a good deal of difference of opinion as to whether the Naval Reserve ought to have an armory or a ship. It is pointed out that for the State to provide a ship would be equivalent to its maintaining a navy, which is unconstitutional. On the other hand, it is said that the Naval Reserve has no use for an armory. The truth, as usual, lies midway between extremes; or, rather, in this case, it includes both. There should be an armory and a ship. The force needs both, and has a right to expect both. It should have an armory with a model ship's side erected in it. Along one side of the armory, say ten feet from the wall, should be built a light wooden model of one of the bulwarks of a man-of-war, the armory floor being the deck. At convenient positions in this bulwark should be erected dummy models of 5- or 6-inch breech-loading rifles, mounted on fixed pivot carriages. At other points there should be one Hotchkiss 3- or 6-pounder rapid-fire, one Hotchkiss revolving cannon, and one Gatling. These secondary guns should be genuine, and not models.

The remainder of the armory would be clear for cutlass, field-gun, and infantry drills. The field artillery and infantry drills are a part of the man-of-war's man's education, and there is not room enough for them on the deck of a ship. All winter long, when the weather would be unfit for outdoor work in boats or aboard ship, the men of the Naval Reserve would be perfecting themselves in their duties in their armory, housed, protected, and on an equal footing with the regiments of the National Guard. To provide this armory, then, it seems to me, is the plain duty of the State of New York. To provide it without the appurtenances necessary for the special instruction of naval artillerymen would be to deprive the new force of its distinctive value, and make it an unnecessary addition to the National Guard.